

New York Tribune.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1914.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, Capital, \$1,000,000. President, G. Vetter, Secretary, J. H. Rogers, Treasurer, J. H. Rogers. Building, No. 134 Nassau street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$3.75 Daily only, 6 months \$20.00
Daily and Sunday, 6 mo. \$20.00 Daily only, 1 year \$35.00
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$35.00 Sunday only, 6 months \$12.50
Daily only, 1 month \$1.25 Sunday only, 1 year \$12.50

FOREIGN RATES.—DAILY AND SUNDAY:
One month \$15.00 One year \$150.00
SUNDAY ONLY:
One month \$8.00 One year \$80.00
DAILY ONLY:
One month \$12.00 One year \$120.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

The Tribune uses its best endeavors to insure the trustworthiness of every advertisement it prints and to avoid the publication of all advertisements containing misleading statements or claims.

The Supreme Court and the Clayton Bill "Gold Bricks."

The Supreme Court's decision in the International Harvester Company's Missouri ouster case takes away a poor excuse which many Representatives have given for voting for the administration's "gold brick" anti-trust bills. "We don't know," say these legislative side-steps, "what the anti-trust bills mean and we are glad we don't know; if we are making improper concessions to Mr. Gompers let the courts catch us and call us down."

That is the spirit of recklessness to which most discriminatory class legislation is due. The legislator wants to be able to say that he did something for this class or for that class. Yet at the same time he would be perfectly satisfied to have a court come along and reclaim on behalf of the public his improper gift. One of the most popular devices of the "gold brick" men at Washington is "putting it up to the courts." From their point of view the happiest thought the framers of the Constitution ever had was to create a federal judiciary on which the responsibility could be thrust of repairing the legislative department's manifold avoidances and blunders of judgment.

But the Supreme Court has just given warning that it will not relieve Congress from all the consequences of its sins of indirection and cowardice. Those Representatives who said to themselves when they voted for what looked like an exemption of labor and farmers' organizations from the provisions of the anti-trust act, "Well, anyway, that will never get past the Supreme Court," will now have to think twice about it. In the case of the exclusion of the International Harvester trust from Missouri the trust argued that the Missouri anti-trust law was invalid because it exempted from its effects organizations of laborers and consumers. But the Supreme Court held that such an exemption was a matter of political policy with which it was not within the province of the judiciary to interfere.

The same attitude might be taken toward the possible exemption of labor and farmers' organizations from the provisions of the Sherman law which are now parts of the Clayton bill. Whatever they are, they may be held to be an exercise of political power not subject to judicial review. It is all the more imperative, therefore, that the Senate should put beyond doubt whether the exemption is intended to be given or not. President Wilson says that the House bills do not authorize class or vocational discriminations in the enforcement of the anti-trust law. But many Representatives who voted for the bills are just as positive that they do.

Let the Democrats in Congress give up dealing in ambiguities and say exactly what they mean. The Missouri opinion suggests that they have the political power to exempt labor and farmers' organizations if they want to do so. Do they want to do so? That is a question on which both the exempted labor and farmers' unions and the other classes of the community jointly discriminated against by the exemption are entitled to a square and honest answer.

A Happier Subway Situation.

Secretary McAdoo's new view of the value of the subway easement under the postoffice building is vastly more creditable to him than his apparent stolid insistence on the \$1,000,000 valuation placed on it by his real estate experts. It gives ground for hope that the city's interests and the federal government's interests may be reconciled without any great difficulty and the public escape the inconvenience and extra expense certain to follow the change in route which the first valuation would have produced.

Payment for this easement practically becomes a question of appraising the damage to the postoffice building, a structure occupied and to be occupied for public uses only. The Public Service Commission has bound itself to bear any cost of reconstruction which the subway work may make necessary, so it is hard for a layman to see that there can be anything more than a nominal value to the easement. A reasonable way of paying for it, advantageous to both sides to the controversy, is suggested by the federal authorities' recommendation that platforms for loading mail be constructed under the postoffice. This will mean a considerable increase in the cost of the subway work, as it was not included in the original plans, but it will mean greatly increased mail facilities. The cost of this work, which the city would bear, might well be taken as full payment for the easement, and Secretary McAdoo and the Public Service Commission and the city authorities shake hands on a satisfactory settlement of the matter.

A Cheering Display for Americans.

The name of Herreshoff has so long been in the ascendant that it has become a tradition by itself. In the eyes of many yachtsmen a Herreshoff craft could not lose. Now that the best and latest defender out of Bristol has been twice soundly thrashed these folk scarcely know what to think. The news seems to them almost unbelievable. The truth is, of course, that our other designers have been developing all the while. Small boat racing has served to keep a dozen good men busy. There is nothing meteoric in the success of William Gardner. His Vanitie was certain to be a rare boat, with an excellent chance of beating the Herreshoff production. The same may be said of the Defiance, which has yet to prove herself afloat, but which is sure to be a strong competitor if her structural problems have been successfully solved.

Of course, the final victory is still a long way off. This week's racing on the Sandy Hook course will add much to our knowledge. The rolling seas of the outside waters will put the defenders to a far more decisive test than the smooth Sound. Whatever the issue, rare, close racing is certain, with the

younger rivals—together a cheering sight for American yachtsmen with the future of the sport at heart.

"I Should Worry."

Our not very near neighbor "The Chicago Tribune" protests against "I should worry." "Demoralizing slang," it calls this popular phrase; moreover, "an expression of the irresponsibility which unites many young people for any dependable service, and it would be strange if with the reiteration of the phrase, in occasion and out of occasion, the irresponsibility did not become fastened as a daily habit."

Isn't this too severe? Has the nation changed so utterly in the few years since it seemed necessary to start "Don't Worry" clubs all over the land—when neurasthenia was the "American disease"—and when cults sprang up everywhere, saying us by teaching us to say to all the ills of life, in effect, "I should worry?"

If the phrase sounds too flippant, why not adopt in its place our discreet and eminently correct President's "psychological"? If business shivers over its losses or your wife comes in with a tale that the cook has left just as dinner guests are about to arrive, it's all in your mind's eye, or "psychological"; or, in the pungent language of the hour, "I should worry."

Our cheerfulness movements have borne fruit. We are, in one phrase, "I should worry," or, if you won't be vulgar, "psychological."

The New French Cabinet.

The new French Cabinet, headed by Senator Alexandre F. Ribot, is admittedly a political makeshift. It will probably have the support for a time of a majority drawn from the Right and Centre groups in the Chamber of Deputies. Yet there is no genuine bond of solidarity between these groups. They all favor the three-year military service law, but on any other issue they are likely to find themselves at swords' points. The Clericals and reactionaries hate the moderate Republicans worse than they hate the Socialists, and at many of the recent second-choice elections the Clerical and reactionary vote went to the United Socialist candidates.

The Ribot Cabinet will exist on sufferance only until the strong dominant groups of the Extreme Left get ready to take power with a cabinet of their own. They are handicapped now because most of their members are committed to the Pau programme, which called for a return to two years of military service. They cannot enforce that demand on the present Chamber and would be greatly embarrassed to have to take office while that issue was still full of dynamite. After the Ribot ministry gets the Chamber to go on record in favor of the three-year law the United Radicals and United Socialists will find the way much clearer to assuming responsibility.

M. Ribot is what would be called in England "an old Parliamentary hand." He has associated with him Senator Leon Bourgeois, another veteran, and Theophile Delcassé, one of France's broad-minded and most capable statesmen. The new Cabinet will, therefore, be extremely respectable in personnel, even though politically it cannot be expected to do anything but mark time.

Perkins and Progressivism.

The issue between Mr. Perkins and Mr. Amos Pinchot seems to boil down to the fact that Mr. Perkins says he is a Progressive, while Mr. Pinchot says Perkins is a plutocrat and never can be anything else. Everybody knows that Mr. Perkins, in spite of his Y. M. C. A. training and traditions, did yield himself to Wall Street and its horrid methods. He did become a trust magnate and do all the dreadful things which such persons do. But he saw the light ere it was too late—so, at least, it was proclaimed broadcast in 1912. He stood at Armageddon. Thenceforth he was understood to be Pure—Positively Progressive—as virtuous as Bill Flinn himself.

Mr. Pinchot's accusations against this brand plucked from the burning are disturbing and destructive of faith. He not only intimates—he says outright—that Perkins' old evil associations and ideas persisted in spite of Progressivism. The spirit of Armageddon could not triumph over the spirit of Wall Street. Perkins was not regenerated; he remained a plutocrat. Even within the sacred ranks of the Progressives he battled for the trusts; he suppressed an anti-trust plank adopted for the Progressive platform; he fought labor and "social justice." Now, if all this be true, Mr. Pinchot's grief and the grief of Governor Stubbs and Governor Johnson and William Allen White and George L. Record and the other fire-tried souls of the inner circle must be harrowing, its pangs sharper than the serpent's tooth. But their pangs are as nothing compared to the pangs of the public. For if it be true that a Perkins could withstand the cleansing influence of the spirit of Armageddon, what of the rest? If Perkins, that sinner over whose repentance there was such joy, did not repent and reform, who can be trusted? And by what test can their protestations be proved?

The muckraker, the modern iconoclast, is undoubtedly a useful citizen. But those whose cherished images he breaks never can really love him. Mr. Pinchot is in that unenviable position. He has deprived the public of its belief in Progressivism's greatest achievement, the purification of Perkins. And if he succeeds in depriving the Progressives of Perkins himself it will be impossible ever to restore complete confidence in the efficacy of Armageddon.

Prosaic Cures for Delinquency.

It is a somewhat prosaic but highly practical method of reforming delinquent boys which Mr. Hillis, president of the New York Juvenile Asylum, discloses. Repair their teeth, put their mastication apparatus into good shape so they can get the benefit of their food, and 90 per cent of the delinquents become normal. "I believe the dentist is the greatest influence for good known to us," says Mr. Hillis, "and that more than 90 per cent of our boys make good and are successful after they leave us."

The Chinese have a proverb that mankind is as prone to goodness as water is to flow down hill. But a boy under fifteen cannot be expected to be "good" if he is anemic, under-nourished, full of ills and weaknesses from mouth, stomach and intestinal troubles. Restored to a physical normal, his mind and conduct respond in a gratifying way. It is a doctrine of uplift which, fortunately, is coming into general acceptance. Communities and their courts are attacking the juvenile delinquency problem not through punishment, but through cure of the degenerating diseases which produce the delinquency. Even more valuable preventive work is being done by school clinics and physical examinations—a branch of work in which city ranks

The Conning Tower

LES MORTS VONT VITE.

Les morts vont vite! Ay, for a little space
We miss and mourn them fallen from their place;
To take our portion in their rest are fain;
But by-and-by, having wept, press on again,
Perchance to win their laurels in the race.

What man would find the old in the new love's face?
Seek on the fresher lips the old kisses' trace?
For withered roses newer blooms disdain?
Les morts vont vite!

But when disease brings thee in piteous case,
Thou shalt thy dead recall, and thy ill grace
To them for whom remembrance plead in vain.
Then, shuddering, think, while thy bedfellow
Pain
Clasps thee with arms that cling like Death's embrace:
Les morts vont vite!

There, ye that know him not, is one of Bunner's poems. And yesterday two college graduates asked us who this Bunner was we were writing about!

BUNNER.

F. P. A.: You must be wrong in your estimate of H. C. Bunner. Some time ago, at a gathering of writers and illustrators, I mentioned his name to a short-story writer and novelist whose work is in great request at the highest prices. As you like sincerity, you will appreciate the candor of this man's confession that he had never heard of the author of "Airs from Arcady." This set me to wondering as to whether a prize contributor to our foremost magazines may not be hampered by a knowledge of literary traditions and literary standards. It may at least afford a slight clue to your conundrum. I think I must be wrong, too; because when I have casually remarked to editors that Bunner's insistence as to literary values in the matter of "light verse" contributed not a little toward establishing certain editorial requirements of his time, I have found my audience unimpressed. Perhaps we are both of us old fogies in our notions about these things; and that is strange, because I read the Bunner Open Letter when it first appeared, whereas you were still in swaddling clothes. Thirty-one years is a long time, and I would remind you that literary fashions change. Bunner was an exemplar of taste, restraint, finish. The professors, I suppose, would call him a classicist. Yet he edited a comic weekly with distinguished success. He had, above all things, the literary touch; even his most trivial contributions were somehow impressed with it. Whether he also possessed a "punch" and a "kick" (excuse quotes) I really cannot say. Perhaps some editor can tell you.

DUSENBURY.

Another myth—we were speaking of them only a year or two ago—is the bum ca-taloupe. We have been doing the marketing lately and we haven't been handed a Ben Davis yet.

THE BROMIDIAN TOUCH.

Sir: Tabby-Dulcinea, you know—has gone to the country. The first one came to-day. "Pardon this abominable stationery," it began, "but, etc." So we shall be married in the fall.

DON JUAN.

"Perhaps," H. & C. hint, "she wonders why people always confide in her. And probably she doesn't care what she eats as long as it's daintily prepared."

SISTERS, SUBCUTANEOUSLY.

F. P. A.: I wonder if Isabel is related to Dulcinea. Tenhydrate, she pulls this one often: "One never sees a sky like this in the city." EDGAR.

And a quinquennial contrib wants to bet that after her arrival at that summer-resort Dulcinea will tell the guests that "she never sleeps well the first night in a strange place."

UNKIND CUTS.

I do not wish to make a hit
By knocking anybody's wit;
But Edar's lines, were I king-pin
Are sure the last thing I'd put in.

DOROTHY.

I love the honest working man
And try to help him all I can—
It would not be so hard to do
If Up, Sinclair weren't trying, too.

A. R. F.

I may jeer at the way he plays the net, and also at how he stands.

I may take no joy in his fancy serve, and mock at his queer backhands,
But I know no garment that looks better
Than F. P. A.'s white tennis sweater.

WEARY.

THE CUT IN PROSE.

Sir: Joe Jackson may be illiterate, but I don't see why he should let that interfere with his writing baseball stories for the newspapers.

THOMAS A. BECKET.

Mme. Schumann-Heink's undivided attention was fixed on her ex-husband—Chicago dispatch.
Her Rapped attention, s. to s.

A HUSBAND'S FIRST DUTY.

[From the Jersey Journal.]
ON ACCOUNT of two stores and wife sick, will sacrifice one of them; grocery, delicatessen and candy store, no competition; excellent business; rent \$15. Call at 331 Ocean Ave.

Do you know? Crudoff Works, originator of the Rottencommon Kids, is with THE GOTHAM WEEKLY GAZETTE. Order next Sunday's issue.—Adv.

AN INDETERMINATE SENTENCE.

[From the Evening Journal.]
London, June 6.—The Daily Telegraph announces the death from an operation made necessary by injuries sustained by being mauled by a leopard of Captain Kelsey, who started recently with a party of automobilists on a trip from Cape Town to Cairo.

Add the Vicarious Press Club: Foxhall Keene.

QUADRIBRACCHIC STUFF.

[From the Times.]
When in front of his home she threw her arms around his neck. He said he felt one of her hands at his hip pocket, while the other hand was attempting to remove his gold watch and chain.

ESTABLISHES A RECORD.

Sir: I sent my first contribution to you the other day and forgot to look for it the next morning. Going some, what? L. M. T.

In this morning's lastline we have the assistance of the Rev. Stephen S. Wise, who, in turn, is assisted by the 37th Chapter of Ecclesiastics.

"For a man's mind is sometimes wont to bring him tidings more than seven watchmen that sit above in a high tower."

F. P. A.

IN OLD MADRID.



THE PEOPLE'S COLUMN

An Open Forum for Public Debate.

A REPLY 'FROM DR. ELIOT

Why He Regards Socialism as an Enemy to Progress.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In reply to Edward W. Van Valkenburgh's inquiry regarding my attitude toward socialism I believe that the progress of mankind toward ideal conditions of labor and life depends on the maintenance of wholesome family life, individual liberty protected and limited by law and the security of private property in both acquisition and transmission. Socialism, correctly defined, seems to me to loosen family bonds, diminish the respect of parents for their children, restrict individual liberty and abolish private property. I believe also that the safe progress of society toward justice and righteousness depends on the development, through continuous struggle and aspiration, of the human virtues in a larger and larger proportion of mankind, and that the development of virtue comes only through freedom, property rights and family love.

That condition of society at which socialism aims—namely, equality of income and of the day's work in production and similarity of total lot for all members of society—would be a very unpropitious condition for the development of the human virtues. What you speak of as "the ultimate attainment of a state approaching equality of income" is, to my thinking, the worst way of trying to attain real human progress and happiness. Variety in occupation, capacity and service, personal ambition for excellence and distinction, competition, rewards proportionate to merits and the fostering of self-denial and self-control seem to me indispensable conditions of all advances of mankind toward ideal wellbeing.

The monotonous and stupid social condition which you picture as desirable seems to me to resemble closely the condition of a community of slaves, with or without a good master. Slaves have always been persons without property rights, with equal income of food, clothing and shelter, loose family ties and neither ambition nor motive for excellence in work.

The far human society has progressed out of savagery toward civilization through steady, productive, voluntary labor, the motives of which have been family love, the transmission of possessions, the joy in personal achievement and the individual's purpose to use his powers for righteous and serviceable ends in liberty. Through the play of these motives every significant achievement of man thinking and working has been brought about. Theoretical socialism perfected would take away from individual man most of these civilizing motives. Then civilization would halt and wait for the advent of a political philosophy which better understood the means of developing human virtue. Any theory of society which would do away with "the struggle for each member of society to succeed" would fail to develop a thriving, progressive human race, and, therefore, to promote the good of the whole.

The watchword, "Each for all and all for each" is a good one, but good only if the hosts that shout it believe without reserve in family life, private property and unselfish individual liberty.

Finally, I believe—and this is necessarily a matter of belief or opinion, since sound and thorough experiments are still lacking—that profit sharing, combined with co-operative management, sick and death benefits, accident insurance, vocational training and good housing, is capable of transforming the present century-old industrial warfare into an era of peace and good will, because it supplies the natural method and means of developing in employer and employed alike industry, frugality, fidelity and efficiency, and, therefore, promotes the human virtues on which alone the political and industrial commonwealth can securely rest.

I am fully aware that there is much poverty, misery and sin in modern white race civilization, but, to my thinking, socialism promises no cure, and not even an amelioration of these evils. On the contrary, it proposes to cut out of the human

soul the nobler motives which have brought the race thus far on its upward way. Democracy is not going to bring about equality of social conditions, but rather infinite inequality as the inevitable result of the variety of human capacity developed in freedom. Democracy will always be seeking to improve both inheritance and environment for every human being and to give every child its own best opportunity, but the happy issue will be not uniformity of attainment and possessions, but an endless, enjoyable diversity. Whether democracy and applied science together will ever furnish "a pleasant material existence to all," as you suggest, is so remote a speculation that it should have no influence whatever on political or social action to-day.

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

Cambridge, Mass., June 1, 1914.

SOME CATHOLICS AND THE FAIR

The Proposed Boycott Is Vigorously Criticized.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: So some Catholics desire to boycott the Panama Fair! The Panama Fair is to demonstrate the progress of this nation as evidenced by the successful completion of the great work of the Panama Canal.
This means that some Catholics would make religion a bar to this nation's progress and would mar its celebration. America has no place for such dark-age narrowness or medievalism.
Catholicism must be set right by the real Catholic authorities, and the boycott of the Panama Fair must be by them repudiated. Protestants will take note.
New York, June 8, 1914. I. PROTEST.

PLAY IN THE CITY STREETS

Its Danger for Children as Affecting Park Policy.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I notice in this morning's paper you give considerable space to the plans of the Park Commissioner to keep little boys and girls off the grass this summer. On the opposite page you felt moved to note the fact that ten persons were killed by automobiles yesterday. Reference to the news columns tells me that four of these were children.

I wonder if it ever occurred to our Park Commissioner that in making our parks uncomfortable for children he drives them into the streets, prey for the speeding automobilist. It seems beyond belief that a single political appointee should hold such autocratic sway over the only places in all this city where tired mothers and restless children can find an hour of rest.

God put down a carpet of grass for little feet to walk upon. It isn't spread before us for park commissioners, in motor cars paid for by the taxpayers, to admire and make foolish speeches about it, and administration dinners. And the hot, tired and exhausted people of this city in no mood to trifle with the silly desire of our present Commissioner to limit their asphalt walks and hard benches when hundreds of acres of grassland are theirs by right.

If you would take up a cause that lies very near to the heart of a big city full of people who want to enjoy their park of people without stupid interference you will spare no words in dealing with this new Commissioner and his precious grass.
New York, June 8, 1914. F. G.

Will Our Wilson Experts Please Answer?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Will you please publish in your paper somewhere on the editorial page (which is the best in New York City) a brief account of the things Wilson has done as President?
Will you also please let me know whether he was a greater success as a scholar or as President? A. L. H.
New York, June 8, 1914.

FREE LOVE AND SUFFRAGE

Taxation Without Representation as It Affects Monogamy.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The connection between taxation without representation and free love has never been clear, and Miss Chittenden's explanation that the connection is only "seemingly" does not relieve her of the suspicion that she is using arguments which are senseless and untrue.
The only possible way in which Miss Chittenden might connect suffrage with license or free love is that aristocrats in every country advocate a restricted franchise, restricted to the propertied class to which they belong, and that never in any age or in any country in the history of the world have the men of the ruling class practised strict monogamy themselves.

Miss Chittenden believes "that the principles of woman suffrage not only menace the home, but threaten the destruction of sound government."

That argument is as old as the human race almost. Certain individuals have always believed that they and they alone possessed sufficient virtue and intelligence to do the governing, and if power and responsibility were extended beyond their immediate circle or family grave catastrophes would ensue. Nobody ever met an anti-suffragist who believed that if she went out to the polls and cast an honest vote for a Mayor or Governor that her home would be desecrated or that free and just government would be jeopardized. It is the other woman of whom she is afraid. Anti-suffragists seem to be oblivious of the fact that every civilized country in the world has granted some form of suffrage to its women, and that the homes in those countries are receiving more attention and consideration than they did before women had a voice in the government. And it is safe to say that the stability of the government in those countries will compare favorably with Turkey, Persia, Russia, Japan, Siam, Timbuctoo and Mexico.

SARA M'PIKE.

Yonkers, June 5, 1914.

THE BLAME FOR THE WRECK

Colonel Roosevelt's Share and That of the "Stand-Pat" Bosses.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I beg to heartily disagree with one Theodore Nelson, of Brooklyn, who in your issue of to-day writes that Colonel Roosevelt is wholly to blame for the wrecking of the Republican party. He is apparently another sorehead who delights in placing another on Colonel Roosevelt, when in truth he like Root, Penrose, Taft and William Barnes are far more to blame. The Republican party in 1912 was corrupt and boss-ridden, and a majority of those voting that ticket knew it all too well, as the election results subsequently showed.

I am not writing this as a Progressive, either, for I am a Republican excepting when the latter party stands for the boss and such rottenness as put it on the rocks two years ago. Colonel Roosevelt is head and shoulders above the party boss and any decent man of principle should welcome his return to the Republican fold. He is the one man and quality, and who can give it principle and quality, and we need him badly to rescue the country from the sad plight into which the Democratic party on Colonel Roosevelt, when in truth he like Root, Penrose, Taft and William Barnes are far more to blame. The Republican party in 1912 was corrupt and boss-ridden, and a majority of those voting that ticket knew it all too well, as the election results subsequently showed.

The "stand-pat" reactionary and unprogressive individual like Theodore Nelson is the type of Republican which has helped to wreck the party, and until they "come to" it is sure to stay high on the rocks. E. WILSON LINCOLN.
Boston, Mass., June 8, 1914.

WE HESITATE TO SAY.

From The Washington Herald.
And what has become of the millions of people who used to play croquet?